

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-28 are pending in the present patent application. Claims 23-28 are being added by this amendment. Claims 1-22 stand rejected.

Office Action Summary:

The Examiner objected to Figure 1 because it fails to show a connection between elements 106 and 108 or between elements 110 and 112.

The Examiner objected to claims 7 and 8 because they lacked clear antecedent basis.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the U.S. Patent No. 4,975,598 to Borkar ("Borkar"). The Examiner, however, indicated that claims 3 and 5 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections.

The Examiner indicated that claims 11-22 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections.

Objection to Figure 1:

The Examiner objected to Figure 1 because it fails to show a connection between elements 106 and 108 or between elements 110 and 112. The attached sheet includes a replacement of Figure 1. This sheet / replacement figure shows connections between elements 106 and 108 and between

elements 110 and 112, respectively. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

Objection to Claims 7 and 8:

The Examiner objected to claims 7 and 8 because they lacked clear antecedent basis. Applicants amended claims 7 and 8 as required by the Examiner to overcome this objection. The term “output” now precedes each instance of the phrase “current regulation circuit” in claims 7 and 8. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

Applicants also wish to point out that similar, inadvertent antecedent basis issues were found in claims 4 and 6. Thus, Applicants amended claims 4 and 6 such that the term “output” now precedes each instance of the phrase “current regulation circuit” in claims 4 and 6.

Rejection of Claims 1-22 Under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph:

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection stems from Applicants’ use of the term “AC” throughout the written description. The Examiner apparently construed this term to mean “alternating current.” Applicants respectfully submit, however, that this is an error. “AC” is merely a label for various *switching* currents, states, and circuitry described and claimed in the application. Thus, Applicants amended the specification, including the title of the invention, and claims to replace use of the term “AC” with the term “switching”. Similarly, the Applicants amended the specification and claims to replace use of the term “DC” with the term “holding”. These latter amendments were made for the sake of consistency and to further eliminate any confusion. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Rejection of Claim 11 Under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph:

The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard

as the invention. Part of the basis for this rejection is use of the term “AC stage”. The examiner apparently construed this term to mean “alternating current stage.” Applicants respectfully submit, however, that this is an error. “AC” is merely a label for various *switching* currents, states, and circuitry described and claimed in the application. To clarify this point, Applicants amended claim 11 (and its dependent claims) to eliminate use of the term “AC” by replacing it with the term “switching”.

Another part of the basis for this rejection is use of the phrase “in parallel”. The Examiner believes that this limitation – in the context of claim 11 – is not physically possible. While Applicants respectfully disagree with this view, they have amended claim 11 to eliminate this limitation and any confusion. The remainder of claim 11 sets forth how the stages of the claimed invention connect and/or cooperate.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is in condition for allowance.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-10 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Borkar. The Examiner, however, also indicated that claims 3 and 5 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections.

Applicants cancelled claim 1 and amended claims 3 and 5, which depended directly from claim 1, to include the limitations of the claim 1. Additionally, Applicants amended claims 2, 4, and 6-10 to depend from claim 3 instead of claim 1.

Applicants also added claims 23-28, which mirror the respective limitations of claims 2, 4, and 6-10. Each of these new claims, however, depends from claim 5.

In view of these amendments and those described in the preceding paragraphs, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 4, 6-10, and 23-28 are in condition for allowance.

Please note that Applicants canceled claim 1 and amended claims 2-10 merely to obtain quick allowance of this application and reserve the right to pursue claim 1 in a continuation application.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 50-2300** referencing docket no. **A1028**. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: August 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted

By _____
Kenneth B. Oplinger

Registration No.: 53,417
Altera Corp.
101 Innovation Drive
San Jose, California 95134
(408) 544-7674